

TERMS.

Published every Saturday, at \$3 in advance, or \$4 at the end of the year. No paper discontinued but at the option of the editors until all arrearages are paid—and a failure to give notice (before the end of the year) of a wish to discontinue will be considered a new engagement.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

One dollar per square, of twelve lines or less for the first insertion, and fifty cents a square for each subsequent insertion.

Where the insertion of an advertisement is ordered, without the number of insertions being specified, it will be inserted, (at the discretion of the proprietors) until forbid, and charged for accordingly.

All advertisements from strangers, as well as all orders for job-work, must be accompanied with the cash, or a reference to some responsible and convenient acquaintance.

AUTHORIZED AGENTS.

Wm. D. MALONE, Huntsville, Randolph co.
N. B. COATES, "

ADDRESS

To the Independent Voters and Freemen of Howard County.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—Unasked and unsolicited from any quarter, I present my name before you as a candidate to represent the county of Howard in the lower branch of the next General Assembly; and unacquainted as I am with many of you, I deem it just and right that I should state to you those principles which have governed me through life, and upon which I hope to be the recipient of your suffrages. I claim to be a Democratic Republican Whig, many of my principles having been formed during the administration of that great Apostle of Liberty, THOS. JEFFERSON, and which have guided me ever since. In relation to State politics the following are my views upon several of the most important subjects which engross the public attention.

1st. Believing that population is the true basis of representation in a Government, I am in favor of the call of a Convention to amend the Constitution, so as to preserve that vital and essential principle under the Constitution. As it now stands, representation is surely unequal and unless changed, the large counties will soon be reduced to a single Representative, whilst the small counties will have the same number and thus the Government will be in the hands of a minority, composing not more than one fourth of the population, and paying less than one third of the State taxes.

2d. I am decidedly opposed to the odious Currency Bills which were attempted to be forced upon the people at the last and previous sessions of the General Assembly. I believe such legislation to be tyrannical, unjust, and an infringement upon the most sacred rights of the citizens.

3d. I am in favor of the election of members to Congress by single districts, believing that this plan is more in accordance with the true theory of our government and that by this mode we will always secure a better representation and that it will relieve us, to some extent, from the odious caucus system by which a few intriguing politicians are enabled to govern and direct the destinies of the State.

4th. I am in favor of a prudent and economical system of Internal Improvements, always keeping the expenditures within reasonable bounds, and commencing first with those objects which will be of the greatest advantage to the largest number of citizens.

5th. I am in favor of a wise and economical administration of the State Government; of abolishing all useless officers; of cutting down all high salaries, so as to lessen the taxes of the People; of short Legislative session; and of such legislation as will aid and assist the people in every laudable enterprise calculated to advance and promote their interests and prosperity.

You may expect me to say something upon public affairs and public men. Well! I am in favor of that great Statesman and Patriot, HENRY CLAY, for the next Presidency, and of that wise and wholesome system of policy of which he has been the zealous advocate for the last thirty years; I believe him to be in every respect superior to Martin Van Buren—a better man—a greater Statesman—and, tried by their Principles, a far better Democrat.

FELLOW-CITIZENS:—I have been for twenty years a resident of Monticau Township, in Howard County. I claim to be nothing more than a plain, practical, everyday Farmer. For forty-one years, I have labored with my own hands to support myself and family, and I think I know something of the interests, the feelings, and the wishes of that large and respectable class who have been similarly situated with myself.

With this short avowal of my principles, I throw myself upon your indulgence, and if chosen one of your Representatives, will serve you with that fidelity which I trust has always characterized me in the private walks of life.

Your friend and fellow-citizen,

THOS. RAWLINGS.

Howard County, April 20, 1844.

BOON'S LICK TIMES.

"ERROR CEASES TO BE DANGEROUS, WHEN REASON IS LEFT FREE TO COMBAT IT."—JEFFERSON.

Vol. 5.

FAYETTE, MISSOURI, SATURDAY, APRIL 27, 1844.

No. 7.

The Presidents of the Clay Clubs

OF SAINT LOUIS,

TO THE WHIGS OF MISSOURI.

With proud satisfaction and heart-felt thankfulness, we announce to you, that, yesterday, your brethren in St. Louis achieved a noble and most important triumph in the annual election of our City Officers—noble, because it gave conclusive proof that the lofty Whig spirit which led them through the struggles of the past, still burns within them, most important, as indicating most decisively the firm and faithful adherence of St. Louis to sound Whig principles. We have flung to the breeze the stainless banner of HENRY CLAY AND PROTECTION TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY, and the glory of a well fought field and a complete and effective victory beams upon and illumines its graceful and ample folds!

The efforts of our opponents were of unprecedented vigor, and were marked by a desperation partaking largely in some quarters, of ferocity. Never before, have they presented so bold and resolute a front, or seemed so confident of, and determined upon success. We met them, however, with equal ardor, courage, and resolution, and we have our reward in announcing to you the election of EVERY REGULAR NOMINATED WHIG, except three members of the City Council. Our failure to elect them, however, does not effect the general result; as, having a majority in both branches of that body, the government of the city is fully in Whig hands for the coming year. Our candidate for Mayor comes in with the very decided majority of three hundred and sixty-two. The majority last year having been one hundred and fourteen against us, this is a gain, within twelve months, of four hundred and seventy-six! This, too, notwithstanding, within two or three weeks hundreds of persons have taken the final step in obtaining naturalization; eight out of every ten of whom, we are persuaded voted against us. In reference, however, to the votes of naturalized citizens, it is only an act of justice to our GERMAN friends, to state, that many of them who have heretofore felt it their duty to oppose us, on this occasion gave us their votes; and we are pleased to believe that this is attributable, in a large proportion of the cases, to our advocacy of the sound and beneficent principle of Protection to American Industry.

We feel that a result so signal and cheering, justifies us in raising joyfully, but in no spirit of vindictive exultation, the voice of congratulation and triumph. We rejoice, fervently rejoice, in our success, but no malignant feelings mingle with our pleasure. We lose sight of the personal defeat of our opponents, and the personal success of our friends, in the nobler and more auspicious triumph of our principles. Those principles, we are now assured, wherever known and understood, must win the feelings, the judgment, and the cordial support of patriotic and reflecting men. Upon them, we, as the advance guard of Missouri Whigs, have met and overpowered the adversary. We hail the great Whig army of Missouri, north, south, and west of us, to follow our example! Raise the standard of HENRY CLAY, and Protection to American Industry, high on every plain and hill-top—let it float on every stream, wave over every workshop, light up every mine, and beam upon every farm-house and log cabin, and we fearlessly predict that 1844 will behold our long wandering State returning, after twenty years estrangement, with swelling acclamations, to him who received her first suffrage, and who is so worthy of her best affections now.

WHIGS OF MISSOURI! This glorious result can be attained only by effort—such effort as the object justifies, as the interests of our State and our country demand, as we can, we must make. Arouse, then, and brace yourselves for the work. RELAX NOT! There is no time to waste. Our energies are all in vigor—let us apply them at once. Our cause is just—let us hasten to place it fairly and urgently before the people. Our friends elsewhere bid us on to the contest—let us answer their call, like true hearted Whigs. Be persuaded that brighter days are dawning, and that, if we are faithful to ourselves, Missouri will be redeemed!

JOHN H. FERGUSON.

President First Ward Clay Club.

THORNTON GRIMSLY.

President Second Ward Clay Club.

JAMES H. LUCAS.

President Third Ward Clay Club.

P. G. CAMDEN.

President Fourth Ward Clay Club.

A. CARR.

President Fifth Ward Clay Club.

NATHAN'L CHILDS, Sen'r.

President Sixth Ward Clay Club.

St. Louis, April 2, 1844.

One glass of liquor each day, says the New York Washingtonian, at six and one fourth cents, costs twenty two dollars and eighty one cents a year. This amount would pay the insurance of three thousand dollars on a man's life.

LOVE AND LIGHTNING.

A lady, who her love had sold,
Ask'd if a reason could be told
Why wedding rings were made of gold?
I ventured thus to instruct her:
Love, M'am, and lightning are the same—
On earth they glance, from Heaven they came;
Love is the soul's electric flame,
And gold its best conductor.

Speech of Mr. Stewart, of Penn.

IN DEFENCE OF

THE TARIFF AND DISTRIBUTION.

Delivered in the House of Representatives of the U. S., March 13, 1844.

Mr. STEWART, of Penn., rose to inquire of the Chair whether the previous question, which had been called on the engrossment of the bill, would preclude discussion on the question now propounded by the Chair, "Shall this bill pass?"

The Speaker having replied in the negative—
Mr. STEWART said: However unprepared, I am nevertheless glad, sir, of the opportunity thus unexpectedly acquired of saying a few words on this important measure before its final passage. On coming into the hall a few minutes since, I was surprised, sir, to learn that this bill to repeal the Distribution Law, reported by the Committee of Ways and Means within the last hour, had been already read a first and second time under the previous question, and was now on its final passage. Sir, is this fair? Is it right, that this bill, by far the most important that has occupied the attention of the present Congress, should thus be hurried through all its stages, and finally passed, under the gag, without amendment or debate? Why this hurry and haste? Why post with such dexterity to this destructive deed? Why is this important measure to be thus despatched in an hour, when days and months have been spent in the discussion of matters of comparative insignificance? The motive cannot be mistaken: its friends are afraid of discussion; they fear the development of facts which must prostrate them before the people; but they cannot escape, sir. They may, by the gag, suppress debate here, but they cannot, thank God, gag the people and the press; they can and will speak out, in tones of thunder against the doings of this day.

The proceeds of the sales of the public lands of this country belonged to the States of this Union. It is a fund which this Government holds in trust for the people of the States; and a period has arrived in our history when, by the mal-administration of this Government, a state of things has been brought about in which the States are involved in debt, a debt which was not only crushing the people of the country under taxation, but was driving some of the States to repudiation and bankruptcy. Is this Government to furnish no relief to the States of this Union? Does it owe no obligations to the States and to the people?

Are we to sit here calmly and see the States and the people of the Union crushed under the weight of direct taxation, see the character of the country disgraced, see repudiation stalking forth throughout the land, and this House and this Government, which had the power to relieve the people from their burdens and redeem this Government from disgrace, do nothing? This was a matter in which this Government was deeply interested. The interest and honor of this Government must be sustained or destroyed with the interest and honor of the States—they are inseparable—we are one people in the estimation of mankind, and share in the same disgrace.

Sir, you will have a surplus in the Treasury, at the end of the year, derived from the existing tariff, if let alone. And what will you do with it? Why not give the proceeds of the land to the States, to which it justly and fairly belongs? If you do not, you will be driven to the necessity of another Distribution Law to divide the surplus revenue among the States.

General Jackson in favor of Distribution.

This policy was strongly recommended and urged by Gen. Jackson, not in one, but in three of his annual messages, and it had been adopted in Congress by a majority of more than four to one, 155 to 38 in the House, and 24 to 6 in the Senate. Yet gentlemen now contend that this measure is not only highly inexpedient, but unconstitutional; and Mr. Van Buren, in his Indiana letter, declares that the people would "stultify" themselves by its adoption, a declaration by which he not only stultifies Gen. Jackson, but himself also. Gen. Jackson, in his first message, advocates the policy of distribution, and says, "the most safe, just, and federal disposition that can be made of the surplus revenue will be its distribution among the States according to their ratio of representation." In his next message of 1830, he renews this recommendation, and takes up and answers, at great length, and with great ability, all the objections that had been urged against the policy of distribution—the very same objections that are here urged by Mr. Van Buren and his friends, he answered and overturned, in their order, No. 1, 2, 3, 4, occupying several pages of his message, to which he commended the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. DROMGOOLE,) who had reported this bill. In his message of 1832, Gen. Jackson again took up and discussed, at great length, the subject of the public lands: he says they ought to "cease, as soon as practicable, to be a source of revenue;" that "the idea of raising revenue from them ought to be abandoned;" that they would endanger the "harmony and union of the States;" and he expressly declares, what is unquestionably true, that these lands were pledged to the General Government to pay the revolutionary war debt, and that that debt being now discharged, the "lands were released from the pledge, and it is in the discretion of Congress," he says, "to dispose of them in such way as may seem to them best." Such are the sound and deliberate opinions of Gen. Jackson; yet Mr. Van Buren, who concurred with him at the

time, now says, in his Indiana letter, that the people would "stultify themselves by the adoption of a proposition so preposterous." These are his words—a high compliment to his "illustrious predecessor"—"a preposterous proposition," which, Mr. Van Buren says, no one but a fool would think of, and that "its agitation, he regrets to say, is calculated to degrade the character of the American people in the estimation of mankind."

These, sir, are perhaps some of the developments which gentlemen intended to suppress by the previous question.

Why not give the land proceeds to the States? We are now receiving under the tariff of '42 more revenue than we want; during the last month we have received more than two millions of dollars in the single port of New York. Suppose we receive in all the other ports in the Union no more than is received in New York, and it will amount to four millions per month, equal to forty-eight millions per year. Still gentlemen are not satisfied, and a bill has been reported by the committee of Ways and Means to repeal the tariff of '42, because it has destroyed the revenue, and they have substituted one which they say will increase the revenue. Yes, sir, the Globe also, in an editorial article of the 10th last month, stated that the last Whig Congress had "doubled the expenditures of the Government, and reduced the revenue one-half"—a statement made in the face of official documents showing that the reverse was much nearer the truth. Yes, sir, the report on the finances at the opening of this session shows that the ordinary expenditures during Mr. Van Buren's administration amounted to nearly thirty-four millions in one year, and averaged more than twenty-eight millions; while in 1842 and '43, under a Whig Congress, the average was little over twenty-three, and that the revenue had been increased by the Whig tariff of '42 from less than fourteen millions in 1840 and '41 to more than eighteen millions in 1842 and 1843, and it would be more than twenty-five, and might possibly reach thirty millions the present year. Yet the Globe says in the face of these facts that the Whigs have "doubled the expenditures and reduced the revenues one half!"

From present prospects, am I not justified, sir, in saying that we shall have a large surplus over and above the current expenditures? Why not then give the proceeds of the lands to the States to relieve the people of the indebted States from the loads of taxation by which they are now ground down to the earth? This fund justly belongs to the States—in the language of Gen. Jackson, this Government now holds it in trust for the States after the paying of the revolutionary debt for which it was pledged, and a court of chancery, upon a bill filed, would decree this fund to the States on proof of the payment of the debt for which it was pledged. You have no use for this fund, then why I repeat, sir, not give it to the States to which it rightfully belongs? What better use can you make of it?

Mr. DROMGOOLE said, pay off the Whig debt with it!

The Whig debt! I thank the gentleman for the suggestion—the Van Buren debt he should have said. Yes, sir, the existing debt was inherited by the whigs from the gentleman and his party; it was the only legacy Mr. Van Buren had left to his country when he retired from office. He had found the treasury with a surplus of more than sixteen millions of dollars over and above the amount deposited with the States, to which add the proceeds of the bank stock, and the amount he received exceeded twenty-four millions. Well, sir, he not only expended this 24 millions with all the revenues of the Government, but he left the people saddled with a debt of \$17,356,998, consisting of treasury notes, unpaid appropriations, and debts outstanding; and this was the debt the gentleman (Mr. DROMGOOLE) is pleased to call the whig debt—it is ours, but we got it by descent, it came from that gentleman and his party; but the whigs could pay it, and would pay it, if gentlemen would let the present tariff alone a few years longer. The whigs had paid part of it, and would soon pay the whole. But if gentlemen succeeded in reducing the tariff as proposed by the Committee of Ways and Means, to which the gentleman (Mr. DROMGOOLE) belonged, (seven out of nine of that committee were Van Buren men,) this debt will soon be again doubled, especially if you superadd the extravagance and prodigality of another Van Buren administration—of which however, sir, I am happy to believe there is not the slightest probability.

But why, let me ask gentlemen, repeal the distribution law? It is not now in operation, and it cannot operate till all the duties are brought down to 20 per cent. Why repeal it then, unless the Committee of Ways and Means contemplate the reduction of the duties to 20 per cent, for till this is done there can be no distribution under the existing law. But I have another question to ask the committee—if you repeal a part, why not repeal the whole of the law? This law gives to each of the new States 500,000 acres of choice land over and above their distributive share. This part of the law is left un repealed, and in full force, while all the rest of the States are deprived of all the benefits of this law now and forever. As to the old States the law is repealed, but the new States are left to enjoy the benefits of its provision. Why is this so? This certainly requires explanation, and it was perhaps partly to avoid this also that the previous question has been called.

The revenue plans of the Committee of Ways and Means are wholly unintelligible to me—precisely the same measure is proposed at one time to reduce, and at another time to increase, the revenue; whether there be too much or too little revenue, the same remedy is recommended, a "reduction of the tariff—down with the tariff." So these political doctors have, it seems, the same remedy for all diseases. In 1832, when we had a surplus revenue of upwards of \$17,000,000, to relieve the treasury, Mr. McDuffie, then chairman of the Ways and Means, reported just such a bill as this reducing duties, and it was then supported by the present chair (Mr. McKAY, of N. C.) as a measure calculated to reduce the revenue. Now that honorable gentleman reports a similar bill reducing the duties for the contrary purpose, the increase of the revenue; how the same measure is to have opposite effects at different times, I am at a loss to discover, perhaps the honorable chairman can explain it. This bill proposes to reduce the duties to about what they were in 1840 and '41, when the revenue from imports was about fourteen millions of dollars. Now, under the present law, (the act of '42,) the revenue would probably be about double that amount, yet the Committee of Ways and Means propose to repeal the act of '42, and reduce the duties to about what they were in 1840 and '41 for the avowed purpose of increasing the revenue. This surely requires explanation; I cannot understand it, nor do I see how any body else can. But how, I ask, is a general reduction of duties to increase the revenue? Clearly this could only be done by a corresponding increase of imports. If you reduce your duties one-half, you must certainly double your imports to get the same amount of revenue. The Secretary of the Treasury says we will have twenty millions of revenue under the existing law, and he wants five millions more, and the Committee of Ways and Means to accomplish this object, instead of increasing the duties one-fourth, reduce them one-fourth; clearly then they must increase imports some years past about one hundred millions; on this, with the present tariff, the Secretary says we will this year have twenty millions of revenue; reduce it one fourth and we will have but fifteen. To make up this loss, we must import twenty five millions more goods; and to add five millions, the required amount to the revenue, we must import twenty-five millions additional, making an increased importation of fifty millions, to get five millions of revenue which is not wanted, and would never be acquired by this measure if it were.

Effects on Farmers and Mechanics.

But our present amount of foreign imports, viz., one hundred millions, is sufficient to supply the demand; how then are you to make room for fifty millions more? This can only be done by destroying fifty millions of dollars of our own domestic productions, to make way for that amount of the productions of foreign industry. We must, according to this financial scheme, not only destroy fifty millions of dollars worth annually of our productive industry, but we must send fifty millions of dollars of hard cash to foreign countries, to purchase what we now do produce, can produce, and ought to produce at home; and for what? To raise five millions of revenue by taxation, which is not wanted! Now, sir, I submit, is this a wise, is it an American policy? Is it not rather a British policy, a plan to reduce the duties and open our ports to the importation of British goods, to the sacrifice and destruction of our own mechanics, farmers, and manufacturers? Yes, sir, and this is to be done by an American Congress, and by the representatives of the American people! Can such an anti-American—such a British system as this, stand for a moment before this free and enlightened people? Pass this bill sir, take five dollars off bar iron, and still more off iron in all its other forms, and, sir, you will go far to extinguish the fires of every furnace and of every forge in Pennsylvania. By this bill you will strike down your own mechanics—your hatters, your shoemakers, your blacksmiths, your tailors, your saddlers; in short, all your mechanics; you will paralyze and prostrate your glass works, paper mills, tanneries, salt works, collieries, lead mines—your woolen and cotton factories; but above all, you aim a death blow at the American farmer, not only by destroying their home markets, almost the only markets they now have, but what is still worse, you will convert the mechanics and manufacturers thus thrown out of employment into agriculturists, into producers instead of consumers of agricultural productions. When you double production and diminish consumption one-half, do you not ruin and destroy the farmers of this country?—And, sir, allow me to say, that in a country like this, where seven-eighths of the entire population is engaged in agriculture, when agriculture is destroyed, the country itself is destroyed. Agriculture is the great basis and foundation on which every thing else depends; when the farmer prospers, all prosper; when he sinks, all the rest, professional men, mechanics, and all go down with him. It is the great object therefore to take care of agriculture, make this prosperous and the whole country will prosper; and how is agriculture to be made prosperous but by building up and sustaining home markets. It is therefore not for the manufacturers, but for the mechanics and farmers, yes, sir, for the farmers, that I advocate the protective policy. There is one important fact which lies deep at the foundation of the whole subject, to which I am

anxious to attract the attention of the farmers and politicians of this country, and it is this, that half, and more than half, of the entire price of the hundred millions of dollars a year of foreign goods imported into this country is agricultural produce raised on a foreign soil, worked up and manufactured into goods, and then sent here for sale; and that the farmers and people of this country send in this way fifty millions of dollars a year to purchase foreign agricultural produce, in the shape of goods, while foreigners take little or nothing from us—our whole agricultural exports to all the world (excepting cotton and tobacco) do not amount to ten millions of dollars a year; thus, sir, we purchase five dollars' worth of foreign agricultural produce to every dollar's worth we sell; this may seem strange, but it is strictly true; I defy contradiction—I challenge investigation. Let gentlemen disposed to contest it select an article of foreign goods, a yard of cloth, a ton of iron, a hat, a coat, a pair of shoes, any thing, "from a needle to an anchor," examine its constituent parts, the raw material, the clothing and the subsistence of the labor employed in its manufacture, and it would be discovered that more than half, often three-fourths, of the whole price is made up of agricultural produce. It is a well known fact that farmers often make hundreds of dollars worth of domestic goods, cloths, &c., without using a dollar's worth of any thing not produced on their own farms; goods and cloths thus made are therefore entirely agricultural; and are not the same materials used in the manufacture of goods, whether made on a farm or in a factory?

Mr. S. said he had ascertained the fact from his own books kept at a furnace, that more than three-fourths of the price of every ton of iron sold, was paid to the neighboring farmers for their domestic goods, their meat and flour, that clothed and fed his hands; for their hay, corn, oats, &c., that sustained his horses, mules, and oxen, employed about his works. In England, iron is made of the same material that constitute it here; well, we now import, manufactured and unmanufactured, eight millions of dollars worth of iron and steel; say only half its value is agricultural produce, converted into iron, and sent here for sale, while our own country is filled with ore and coal, buried and useless, and the produce of our farmers left without markets. Will the farmers of this country submit to such a system as this—openly advocated and adopted to favor foreign industry at the expense of our own? Will they tamely and silently agree thus to be crushed and sacrificed? No, sir, they will not; they will speak out against the unjust and ruinous measures; your tables will soon groan under the weight of their remonstrances against it. I call on them to do so; I call on them to come to the rescue before it is too late.

BRITISH BILL.

The avowed object of this bill is to open our ports to the importation of British goods—to favor foreign farmers and mechanics, and destroy our own. Sir, give the people time to be heard, and this bill cannot pass; let it be discussed, and it never can pass an American Congress. There is one way in which it can pass—send it to the British Parliament, and it will be passed by acclamation. England would give millions to secure its passage. It had recently been stated in an official report, read in the House of Commons, that unless the American Tariff of 1842 was modified and reduced, Great Britain would have to pay the United States cash for their cotton, instead of paying in goods as she formerly had done; and this bill accordingly modifies and reduces the Tariff of 1842 to suit the wishes of the British Chancellor, who, while he recommends free trade and low duties to us, takes special care to adhere to his own prohibitory system. While this bill proposes greatly to reduce the duties on foreign distilled spirits, England exacts a duty of 2,700 per cent. on ours; and this is reciprocity! This bill reduces the duties on tobacco and its manufactures, while England demands 1,200 per cent. on ours, and actually collects 22 millions dollars of revenue annually from our tobacco, equal to the whole revenue of this Government—such is British reciprocity and free trade. Since the Tariff of 1812, the tables with England have been turned; last year the balance of trade with Great Britain exceeded \$13,000,000. The imports of specie had in the last year reached the unprecedented amount, as appears by official reports, of more than 23 millions of dollars, most of it from Great Britain. No wonder England and her statesmen were anxious for the reduction of the American Whig Tariff of '42. No wonder her Chancellor exclaims against the Tariff, and says it will oblige them to send us specie instead of goods hereafter to pay for cotton. No wonder our country is rapidly recovering from its late depression—that its course is again onward and upward—that its former prosperity is returning—a prosperity it always had and always would have under an efficient protective system, but which it never had and never would have without it. No wonder specie had become abundant—that the banks had resumed—that exchanges had become equalized and interest reduced—that manufactures had revived—that agriculture was recovering—that the mechanic and every other branch of the national industry was fully and profitably employed. All these were the necessary and undeniable fruits of the existing tariff policy—results seen, felt, and acknowledged throughout the land—yet in the face of all these facts—shutting their eyes to these great lights blazing up before them the Committee of Ways and Means have reported a bill to repeal this beneficial act of 1842, and bring us back to the low duties and low condition of 1840—They have struck a death blow at this policy—a policy which had vindicated its adoption by all its fruits, which had fulfilled all the hopes of its friends, and falsified all the predictions of its enemies; but shall this blow be unavailing? No, sir, it will recoil and overwhelm its authors. The